

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT
FOR:
Neighborhood Services (Mary Rigg)**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Unsatisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	Non-Compliance
Recruiting Materials	Satisfactory	Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	In Compliance
Academic Program	Unsatisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	In Compliance
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 4-5:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

Provider submitted 1) a corrective action plan that described how it will ensure (in the future) that the major program elements (and lessons) described in the application will be incorporated into each tutoring session; 2) a copy of a revised progress report, and 3) a corrective action plan that detailed how the provider will ensure that, for all future tutors, background checks are conducted prior to tutors working with children.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Neighborhood Services (Mary Rigg)
REVIEWER: ST, SF, LR

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 3/1/07

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	S	U	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	ONE of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)	-Recruiting policy -Teacher licenses	S		Tutor recruitment policy matches description in provider application. Tutor qualifications match provider application.
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment fliers -Program descriptions for parents	S		Program descriptions and recruitment fliers for parents are appropriate and in-line with provider application.
Academic Program	ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for one class in all subjects offered <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Detailed lesson description -Specific connections to Indiana standards -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	-Lessons for math and language arts -Connection of lesson plans to Indiana academic standards		U	Although lessons connect to Indiana academic standards, lessons submitted for monitoring and observed lessons do not match those submitted in original application.
Progress Reporting	TWO of the following: -Sample progress report -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	-Progress report timeline -Progress report		U	Progress report timeline states reports are sent monthly rather than bi-weekly as stated in provider's original application. Progress reports do not match original provider application.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Neighborhood Services (Mary Rigg)

DATE: 2/20/07 & 2/21/07

SITE: George Washington Community School & George Goodwin Center (Indpls)

REVIEWER: ST, SF, LR

TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): TW, SD, CG, Ms. Thomas

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 2:55 & 4:45p.m.

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 4

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		U	Students spent half the session (30 minutes) working on lessons and the other half completing homework. Students were observed completing homework assignments independently and periodically requesting assistance from tutors as needed. At one tutoring site, students in the second grade or higher worked on the A+ computer software program on math problems with the guidance of a tutor. Each student’s computer program was individualized to the student’s math ability level. Students completed lessons online and received assistance from the tutor when requested. The first grade students at this site completed worksheet packets that focused on building reading skills during the lesson/curriculum period of the tutoring session. Students read passages to their tutor and then worked on pronunciation and practicing words with which they had difficulty. Observed lessons did not match lessons or lesson description submitted in provider’s original application. Although the application highlights peer learning, group work and cooperative learning, this was not observed at either site. Students were primarily observed working at tables (that also had other students sitting there) individually on their assignments or on the computer with interaction from tutors mostly only when they requested tutor assistance. In addition, the application does not discuss the use of the A+ software system, however, this is a major part of tutoring program (with the exception of first graders) at the Goodwin Center. Lastly, although provider application states individual plans that “will focus on instructional strategies to meet the individual academic needs of each student” will be used, the submitted individual plans were actually general goal statements, did not provide instructional strategies for tutoring session lessons, and tutors did not refer to such plans to direct lesson instruction during observed lessons.
Instruction is clear	S		For the most part, tutors provided clear directions that students were able to understand. Tutors were available for direct support if/when students requested assistance. No instruction was observed at one site as the one student present worked on his homework independently during the observed session. In addition, it appeared that tutors typically responded to questions rather than conducting lessons or providing instruction.
Time on task is appropriate	S		Students generally stayed on task. Tutors were able to redirect students who were supposed to be working independently on assignments when they were off task. However, at one site, a few students (possibly finished with their work) were observed to be somewhat on their own roaming the room or sitting away from the group watching others with little direction from tutors. There were also periods during this tutoring session when the noise level was a distraction. In addition, for some students, the tutoring session seemed to be less organized as it was sometimes difficult for reviewers to understand what group some students were supposed to be in as they would move from group to group during observed session. Providing more structure to the tutoring session and providing clearer guidelines to students regarding appropriate activities to complete after they are finished with lessons would be beneficial.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	S		Tutors appeared familiar with the content of the assignments as evidenced their ability to appropriately clarify directions and answer questions posed by students in manner that was easy for them to understand. Tutors used encouragement and modeling that was age appropriate.
	S		Application notes that the ratio will be 5:1 and that instruction will be in small groups. A 4-5:1 ratio and small group instruction were observed.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Neighborhood Services (Mary Rigg)

REVIEWER: ST, CE

DATE DOCUMENTATIONRECEIVED: 3/1/07

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks were submitted; however, some checks were not completed prior to tutors working with students		NC
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Student release policy -Evacuation map -Department of Health documentation	C	
Financial viability	TWO of the following: -Notarized business license or formal documentation of legal status -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Audited financial statement -IRS statement	C	

